

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCSBN 9990)
 United States Attorney
 BRIAN J. STRETCH (CASBN 163973)
 Chief, Criminal Division
 BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY (CASBN 241350)
 Assistant United States Attorney
 150 Almaden Boulevard
 San Jose, California 95113
 Telephone: (408) 535-5059
 Facsimile: (408) 535-5066
 Email: benjamin.t.kennedy@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for the United States of America

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. CR 07-00624 JW
)	
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
)	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME FROM
v.)	OCTOBER 15, 2007 TO OCTOBER 29,
)	2007 FROM THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
ARTURO JAIME FONSECA-RAMIREZ,)	CALCULATION (18 U.S.C. §
)	3161(h)(8)(A))
Defendant.)	
)	
)	

The parties stipulate that the time between October 15, 2007 and October 29, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161, and agree that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Finally, the parties agree that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public, and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases.

//

1 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

2
3 DATED: October 16, 2007

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
United States Attorney

4
5 /s/
6 BENJAMIN T. KENNEDY
Assistant United States Attorney

7
8 /s/
9 LARA VINNARD
Assistant Federal Public Defender

ORDER

Based upon the stipulation of the parties, and for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that the time between October 15, 2007 and October 29, 2007 is excluded under the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The court finds that the failure to grant the requested continuance would unreasonably deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. Furthermore, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and in the prompt disposition of criminal cases. The court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:

JAMES WARE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE